

- 1.2 In November 2010, the Audit and Risk committee agreed to the co-option of an Independent member to the committee. Following this, in January 2011 an advert was placed in the Evening Sentinel and on the Council's website to which no responses were received. This was followed up in July 2011 with a second round of adverts, this time being placed again on the Council's website and also a copy placed on public noticeboards at Council premises, again this recruitment process was unsuccessful.
- 1.3 Following discussions with Keele University, the current Independent Member was co-opted onto the committee in 2012. This appointment was for an initial period of three years.

2. **Issues**

- 2.1 This three year appointment comes to an end in June 2015 and therefore the committee needs to decide if they wish to continue with the appointment of a co-opted member to the committee.
- 2.2 Discussions with the current Independent member have confirmed that they are happy to continue with the appointment for a further three years. Should the committee wish to continue with a co-opted member then this would be the preferred option particularly in view of the difficulties experienced in previously in trying to recruit.

3. **Reasons for Preferred Solution**

- 3.1 If members were to approve the continued co-option of the independent member to the committee then they would be continuing to adopting 'good practice' processes and procedures which overall would contribute to reducing risks and liabilities to the Council.

4. **Outcomes Linked to Corporate Priorities**

- 4.1 An effective Audit Committee means that the Authority can place reliance on the assurances of the systems of internal control. If controls are operating effectively the potential for fraud and corruption is reduced. There is also an assurance that resources are being used efficiently and effectively.

5. **Legal and Statutory Implications**

- 5.1 Under the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 the Council is required to undertake an annual assessment of the effectiveness of its Audit Committee. A co-opted member onto the committee will help to demonstrate this effectiveness.

6. **Equality Impact Assessment**

- 6.1 There are no differential equality impact issues identified from this proposal.

7. **Financial and Resource Implications**

- 7.1 In terms of costs these are limited to the payment of travelling expenses only which are paid for each meeting attended, and are based on the rates set out in the table below;

		451- 999 cc	1000 -1199 cc	Above 1200 cc
Per mile for first 8,500 miles	Inside Borough	46.9p	52.2p	65.0p

8. **Major Risks**

8.1 If the Authority does not maintain an effective Audit Committee; reliance cannot be placed on the adequacy of the internal controls operating throughout the Authority.

9. **Background Papers**

CIPFA's Audit Committees Practical Guidance for Local Authorities

10. **Management Sign-Off**

Each of the designated boxes need to be signed off and dated before going to Executive Director/Corporate Service Manager for sign off.

	Signed	Dated
Financial Implications Discussed and Agreed		
Risk Implications Discussed and Agreed		
Legal Implications Discussed and Agreed		
H.R. Implications Discussed and Agreed		
ICT Implications Discussed and Agreed		

Report Agreed by: Executive Director/ Head of Service		
--	--	--